

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,774	03/05/2002	Yu-Ming Huang	0941-0418P-SP	8816
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747			EXAMINER	
			YENKE, BRIAN P	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			2622	
e				•
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	. 01/08/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 01/08/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/087,774	HUANG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	BRIAN P. YENKE	2622				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timulated the application to become ABANDONE	J. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•	•				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE	(Amendment (11 Dec 06)					
	action is non-final.					
· <u>—</u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some ★ c) None of:						
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
		1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Attachment(s)						
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
Notice of Platsperson's Patent Brawning Review (PTO-946) Statement (S) (PTO/SB/08) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-/ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•				

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11 Dec 06 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 06 Jun 06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's Arguments

a) Pertaining to the applicants remarks that Cottle recites that the display area does not contain any OSD data, such as background color or motion video, is not included in the frame memory (see column 42, line 37-39, Fig 18e). Thus data stored in frame memory of Cottle is OSD data only, not frame data corresponding to a frame of a display screen without OSD data., nor does Cottle disclose the determination of an OSD function being enabled.

Examiner's Response

Art Unit: 2622

b) The examiner agrees that Cottle discloses such a passage. However, Cottle also discloses that the frame memory may include non-OSD data (Fig 18D both figures), where the background color or motion video are stored in the frame memory when the window includes non-OSD data. Cottle discloses a system which utilizes SDRAM 312 which includes buffers 312a and OSD buffer 312b, where OSD controller 270 (Fig 18b) is able to simultaneously display different kinds of bit-map, graphic, still video picture, motion video picture or background color (para 371). Thus the frame memory/SDRAM 312 receives the data necessary for display from CPU memory 240 which acts as a temporary buffer (para 93-94). The system mixes OSD and non-OSD data for display, thus meeting the determining if an OSD is enabled and whether mixing of such is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

.Claims 1-3 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cottle et al US 6,263,3961.

As is broadly illustrated in figure 18e, Cottle et al described an OSD control .

system which comprises:

Art Unit: 2622

- a) A display memory comprised of a frame memory (312);
- b) A memory (240); and
- c-d) Circuitry for copying OSD data into the display memory (312) from the memory (240), wherein the system mixes OSD and non-OSD data for display, thus meeting the determining if an OSD is enabled and whether mixing of such is required.

In considering claim 2,

Note element 272 of figure 18B.

In considering claim 3,

Note element 1040 of figure 18B.

It is noted that Cottle discloses that the display screen may include non-OSD data (i.e. Full screen background 1110 (Fig 18D) or Full screen MPEG motion picture 1120 (Fig 18D) in addition to OSD data (windows 1100, 1102, 1104, 1106, 1122, 1124).

Thus the frame data corresponds to frame of a display screen with and/or without OSD data (Fig 18d/e) meeting the claimed limitation.

Regarding the newly added claims, Cottle discloses that the frame memory (312) stores the frame data or not and OSD data, after the OSD data is stored in CPU memory 40 meeting the claimed limitation. Cottle also discloses the claimed outputting the data (frame data or not and OSD data) to a screen display (Fig 18d/18e). Cottle also discloses the storage/display of multiple OSD data types (i.e. different windows) meeting the claimed storing another OSD data.

Art Unit: 2622

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 4-7 and 15-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cottle et al US 6,263,3961.

In considering claims 4-5,

The claims differ from the showing of Cottle et al. only in the recitation of the nbit block transfer flag".

It would at least have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the system disclosed by Cottle et al. with a "flag" via the bit block transfer mode for tracking transfers of the OSD via the bit block transfer flag.

In considering claims 6-7,

Art Unit: 2622

The claims differ from the showing of Cottle et al. only in the recitation of the "overlay flag".

It would at least have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the system disclosed by Cottle et al. with "flag" for tracking the window location configuration of the frame memory into which the OSD is transferred; i.e. such flags would be cleared wherever the window configuration was changed.

In considering claims 15-16,

The claim adds the limitation of "an interface card" in addition to the rejected limitations as shown above (refer to claim 1). Although, Cottle does not explicitly recite such feature with the memory, Cottle discloses the use of interface cards/smart cards (i.e. 280-1 Fig 1b) in relation to system processing. Thus the use of interface cards which comprise memory (i.e. buffer/registers) is conventional in the art based upon the systems needs/requirements/component availability, thus the examiner takes "OFFICIAL NOTICE" regarding such, since such cards typically provides the benefits of various/multiple functions on a single card, thereby reducing size and providing ease in interchanging of such components.

In considering claim 17,

Refer to claim 2 above.

In considering claims 18-19,

Refer to claim 3 above.

In considering claim 20,

Refer to claim 4 above.

In considering claims 21-22,

Art Unit: 2622

Refer to claim 5 above.

In considering claim 23,

Refer to claim 7 above.

In considering claim 24,

Refer to claim 8 above.

In considering claim 25,

Refer to claim 9 above.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Yenke whose telephone number is (571)272-7359. The examiner work schedule is Monday-Thursday, 0730-1830 hrs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, David L. Ometz, can be reached at (571)272-7593.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571)-273-8300

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is

(703)305-HELP.

Art Unit: 2622

General information about patents, trademarks, products and services offered by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), and other related information is available by contacting the USPTO's General Information Services Division at:

800-PTO-9199 or 703-308-HELP

(FAX) 703-305-7786

(TDD) 703-305-7785

An automated message system is available 7 days a week, 24 hours a day providing informational responses to frequently asked questions and the ability to order certain documents. Customer service representatives are available to answer questions, send materials or connect customers with other offices of the USPTO from 8:30 a.m. - 8:00p.m. EST/EDT, Monday-Friday excluding federal holidays.

For other technical patent information needs, the Patent Assistance Center can be reached through customer service representatives at the above numbers, Monday through Friday (except federal holidays) from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST/EDT.

The Patent Electronic Business Center (EBC) allows USPTO customers to retrieve data, check the status of pending actions, and submit information and applications. The tools currently available in the Patent EBC are Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) and the Electronic Filing System (EFS).

PAIR (http://pair.uspto.gov) provides customers direct secure access to their own patent application status information, as well as to general patent information publicly available. EFS allows customers to electronically file patent application documents securely via the Internet. EFS is a system for submitting new utility patent applications and pre-grant publication submissions in electronic publication-ready form. EFS includes

Art Unit: 2622

software to help customers prepare submissions in extensible Markup Language (XML) format and to assemble the various parts of the application as an electronic submission package. EFS also allows the submission of Computer Readable Format (CRF) sequence listings for pending biotechnology patent applications, which were filed in paper form.

RPY

03 January 2007

BRIAN P. YENKE